UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,799	12/31/2001	Mark Kirkpatrick	BS01-169	5668

45695 7590 08/25/2005

WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH
P. O. BOX 71355
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER	
DICKESON, MATTHEW A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/029,799	KIRKPATRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew A. Dickeson	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 April 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' amendment was received on 03/04/2005, and the information referred to therein has been considered by the examiner. Claims 1-15 were presented for examination. Claims 1, 6, 10, 13, and 14 are currently amended; claim 15 is new. Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application and were considered by the examiner.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment to the specification, see p. 7 of applicants' amendment, filed 3/4/2005, is acceptable; accordingly, the objection previously made to the specification is withdrawn. The examiner notes that paragraph 19 of the specification was amended to correct a typographical error and that paragraph 34 of the specification was amended in response to the previous objection to the specification, in contrast to applicants' remarks.

3. The replacement drawings were received on 04/25/2005. These drawings are acceptable; accordingly, the objection previously made to the drawings is withdrawn.

4. The amendments to claims 1, 10, 13, and 14, see p. 8 of applicants' amendment, filed 3/4/2005, are acceptable to overcome the rejections previously made under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of claims 1-9, 13 and 14; accordingly, the rejections made to these claims are withdrawn.

5. The amendment to claim 6, see p. 4 of applicants' amendment, filed 3/4/2005, is acceptable to overcome the objection previously made to this claim; accordingly, the objection made to this claim is withdrawn.

6. The examiner wishes to clarify that the content of the interview summary provided with applicants' amendment, filed 3/4/2005, is not complete. The applicability of the Fong reference was discussed, and agreement was reached regarding the Fong reference positively applying as prior art in this case, and that applicants' claims would be amended to distinguish over the Fong reference, as have been presented in applicants' amendment, filed 3/4/2005. Please see Interview Summary, dated 2/15/2005.

7. Applicant's arguments, see pp. 8-10 of applicants' amendment, filed 3/4/2005, with respect to claims 1 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett et al. (5,062,147) in view of Mueller (6,115,544) and in view of Smith, Jr. et al. (5,761,510).

Referring to claim 1, Pickett et al. ('147) disclose a computer monitoring system (see Figs. 1-18 and related text). The method of Pickett et al. ('147) comprises:

"*scanning at least one source file of a computer application to be monitored for one or more notification messages, the source file being stored in a first location*" (see Fig. 1 and related text, e.g. Col. 3:7-11, and Col. 6:40-52, which describes monitored entities as comprising a job name (*application*) and a path to a disk drive, which may represent a source file.)

"*displaying the notification message in a graphical user interface*" (see Fig. 1 and related text, e.g. Col. 5:24-30.)

"*generating an export file in a format compatible with a system monitor, the export file comprising the modifiable severity and the modifiable second location*" (see

Figs. 2 and 7-8 and related text, e.g. Col. 11:62-65, Col. 12:33-38 (*modifiable second location*), and Col. 14:7-11 (*modifiable severity*).)

Pickett et al. ('147) do not explicitly disclose that the notification messages are extracted from a source file, or that the notification message, modifiable severity, and modifiable second location are displayed simultaneously in the graphical user interface.

Mueller ('544) discloses a method and system for displaying error messages, comprising:

"*displaying in the graphical user interface simultaneously with the notification message, a modifiable severity and a modifiable second location corresponding to the notification message whereby the modifiable second location indicates a log file location where the notification messages are stored when generated by the computer application*" (see Figs. 2-3 and related text, e.g. Col. 3:25-30, Col. 3:49-51, and Col. 7:26-28. These teachings illustrate that a message is displayed in a graphical user interface, whose contents are modifiable, simultaneously with the file that the message is derived from (*modifiable second location [that] indicates a log file location where the notification messages are stored when generated by the computer application*), and optionally (and simultaneously) with a severity code that accompanies the message.)

Mueller ('544) states that "error data may be transmitted ... as message data when the system supports program to program messages", such as those described in the system of Pickett et al. ('147), "but it may also be communicated in file form." (See Col. 2:31-35) However, Mueller ('544) also does not explicitly disclose extraction of the message from the source file.

Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) disclose a method for error identification in a program interface, comprising:

"*extracting the notification message from the source file*" (see Fig. 5-6 and related text, e.g. Col. 8:49-57, and Col. 9:17-23. These teachings describe a header file (*source file being stored in a first location*) which is parsed for error messages; the error messages are extracted from the header file and placed in an error header file (*a modifiable second location*).)

Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) state that the names and locations of the header file (*source file of a computer application to be monitored*) and the error header file (*modifiable second location*) are contained in a database file (see Col. 8:18-25); it is well known in the art that the contents of database files are modifiable by a user. A user might modify the error header file, for example, to store generated errors in a different location to compare errors generated during different executions of the test program described by Smith, Jr. et al. (see Fig. 5 and related text, e.g. Col. 13:56-57, and Col. 14:19-20.). Further, the contents of this error header file could be transmitted in file form for presentation to the user through the graphical user interface disclosed by Mueller ('544), an interface that could be used to display the messages, modifiable severities, and modifiable file locations disclosed by Pickett et al. ('147).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the claimed invention was made by applicant to have modified the system of Pickett et al. ('147) with the teachings set forth by Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) to create a system capable of scanning files of computer applications, extracting

messages from those applications, displaying information to the user regarding those messages, and generating export files usable to monitor the applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make these modifications to enhance the system of Pickett et al. ('147) with the newer capabilities taught by Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510), thus providing a more robust system with greater functionality and ease of use.

Referring to claim 2, the rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated; in addition, Mueller ('544) illustrates:

"*assigning a default value to the modifiable severity*" (see Col. 4:48-55, describing default color assignment to error messages displayed based on their severity.)

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the claimed invention was made by applicant that by incorporating the teachings of Mueller ('544) into the system of Pickett et al. ('147), default values had already been assigned to the modifiable severity.

Referring to claim 3, the rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Pickett et al. ('147) shows the display of a message with its modifiable severity in a data entry form (see Fig. 8). Mueller ('544) shows the simultaneous display of the message with its corresponding location and severity code in an expanding/contracting list-type dialog (see Fig. 3). Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) makes reference to an error table that describes when errors occur as a result of parsing, compiling, and execution of a test program (see Fig. 8). However, Pickett et al. ('147), Mueller ('544), and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) do

not explicitly disclose the use of a table to display the notification message, the modifiable severity and the modifiable location in a table in a graphical user interface.

However, it would have been readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant that the data of Pickett et al. ('147) pertinent to applicant's invention (notification message, modifiable severity, modifiable location) could have been easily displayed together according to the teachings of Mueller ('544) in one of many different GUI forms, including a table. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the display means set forth in Pickett et al. ('147) to display the pertinent data together in one table to facilitate a simple and concise interface for the user, and to eliminate the need for contracting and expanding lists of error messages pertaining to a particular file, thus reducing code complexity.

Referring to claims 4-6, the rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated; furthermore, Pickett et al. ('147) show:

"*modifying the modifiable severity, wherein the export file comprises the modified modifiable severity*" (see Figs. 8 and 15 and related text, e.g. Col. 14:7-11, describing an option in the user interface which allow the user to assign color values input interactively (*modifying the modifiable severity*) that are used in displaying the message to the user, saved in the message action file which is keyed to respond to a particular received message. When viewed in context of the teachings of Mueller ('544), these colors correspond to severity levels associated with the message.)

"*modifying the modifiable location, wherein the export file comprises the modified modifiable location*" (see Figs. 8 and 15 and related text, e.g. Col. 12:33-42, describing

an option in the user interface which allow the user to assign values input interactively (*modifying the modifiable location*) to define which file is to be accessed in the processing of a message, saved in the message action file which is keyed to respond to a particular received message.)

"*storing temporarily the notification messages in a data file in a third location; and extracting the notification messages from the data file for display in the graphical user interface*" (see Figs. 4-5 and 8 related text, e.g. Col. 7:35-38, describing how incoming messages are stored in a memory buffer (*data file in a third location*), Col. 8:32-42, describing the updating of messages on display to the user in response to message processing, and Col. 12:47-67 and Col. 13:1-5, describing conditional processing of messages in the buffer. In each case, once the message is processed, the system's attention turns to the next message in the buffer. A memory buffer is inherently a location for temporary storage of information, as the buffer continues to receive new data and release data that has already been processed.)

Referring to claim 10, Pickett et al. ('147) provide a user-programmable system for computer monitoring.. The system comprises:

"*an export module to store data in the table in a format acceptable to the system monitor*" (see Figs. 2 and 7-8 and related text, illustrating a file maintenance module and components thereof which stores data displayed to the user, e.g. Col. 11:62-65, Col. 12:33-38 (*modifiable second location*), and Col. 14:7-11 (*modifiable severity*).)

Pickett et al. ('147) describe a device or entity which the system monitors (see Col. 6:40-52), a communication process that receives messages from the entity being

monitored (see Col. 5:15-18), and which analyzes those messages and processes them (see Figs. 4 and 5 and related text, e.g. Col. 7:33-45, describing messages stored in a memory buffer (*scan file*)), and a screen control process that updates the display, including a scrollable display usable by the user to view messages (see Col. 5:24-30). However, Pickett et al. ('147) do not explicitly disclose a source file integral to the application to be monitored, an import module to extract messages from the source file and store them in the scan file, or a manager module that displays the messages stored in the scan file and concurrently accepts a user modifiable severity level and a modifiable second location.

Mueller ('544) discloses a system for displaying error messages, comprising:

"*a source file integral to a computer application to be monitored which is stored in a first location*" (see Col. 3:5-11.)

"*a manager module to display each of the notification messages stored in the scan file in a table in a scrollable window in a graphical user interface and to concurrently accept a user modifiable severity level and a modifiable second location which is a log file location for error messages that are generated by the application*" (see Figs. 2-3 and related text, e.g. Col. 3:25-30, Col. 3:49-51, Col. 4:48-55, and Col. 7:26-28. These teachings illustrate a graphical user interface display, whose contents are modifiable, simultaneously with the file that the message is derived from (*modifiable second location which is a log file location for error messages that are generated by the application*), and optionally (and simultaneously) with a severity code that accompanies the message. The messages are displayed in different colors to indicate severity.

Mueller ('544) also states that where the user modifies the source code file, if the error is detectable, it is added to the error list immediately (see Col. 3:41-44). It is inherent, then, that if the user modifies the location of the file and not the code in the file, since the error was initially detectable, the GUI display will change to reflect the new file location automatically.)

However, Mueller ('544) does not explicitly disclose an import module to extract notification messages from the source file and store them in a scan file, nor are the severities described in Mueller ('544) necessarily user-modifiable.

Smith, Jr. et al. disclose a method for error identification in a program interface, comprising:

"*an import module to extract notification messages from the source file and store the notification messages in a scan file*" (see Fig. 5-6 and related text, e.g. Col. 8:49-57, and Col. 9:17-23. These teachings describe a header file (*source file*) which is parsed for error messages; the error messages are extracted from the header file and placed in an error header file (*a scan file*).)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the claimed invention was made by applicant to modify the system of Pickett et al. ('147) using the teachings of Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) for the reasons and motivations discussed above in the rejection of claim 1. Doing so would produce a system that monitors a source file integral to an application to be monitored, extract and store messages from that source file and store them in a scan file, subsequently display those stored messages and modifiable attributes associated with those messages in a

GUI display, and save the modifiable attributes in an export file. Also, by combining the teachings of Mueller ('544) with the system of Pickett et al. ('147), the colors associated with severity levels become modifiable by means of the message action definition dialog (see Pickett et al. ('147), Fig. 8).

Referring to claims 11 and 12, the rejection of base claim 10 is incorporated; furthermore, Pickett et al. ('147) show:

"*means for modifying the data in the table*" (see Figs. 8 and 15 and related text, illustrating a means for the user to modify attributes associated with a particular message, including severity and a file location.)

"*means for converting data in the table to the format acceptable to the system monitor*" (see Figs. 7-8 and 15 and related text, describing how data modified by the user is stored with key values, usable by the system to interpret messages received from the computer being monitored by matching the message with its corresponding key value and corresponding message actions.)

10. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett et al. (5,062,147) in view of Mueller (6,115,544) and in view of Smith, Jr. et al. (5,761,510), and further in view of Greenfeld (4,931,928).

Referring to claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated. Although Pickett et al. ('147) teach the step of storing received data information in a memory buffer (*data file*) for later extraction and display to the user, the reference does not teach the step of removing duplicated information from the memory buffer.

Greenfeld ('928) describes an apparatus for analyzing source code, in which he states that "In analyzing a source file, the analysis subsystem must first remove from the database any information extracted previously from this source file (*removing duplicate notification messages from the data file*) ... This prior removal is necessary for the reliability of the data in the database" (see Col. 7, l. 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of invention by applicant to further modify the method of Pickett et al. ('147), modified by the teachings of Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510), further introducing the step of removing duplicate information from that file using the teachings and motivation set forth in Greenfeld ('928).

Referring to claim 15, Pickett et al. ('147) disclose a computer monitoring system (see Figs. 1-18 and related text). The method of Pickett et al. ('147) comprises:

"*scanning at least one source file of a computer application to be monitored for one or more notification messages, the source file being stored in a first location*" (see Fig. 1 and related text, e.g. Col. 3:7-11, and Col. 6:40-52, which describes monitored entities as comprising a job name (*application*) and a path to a disk drive, which may represent a source file.)

"*displaying the notification message from the processed data file in a graphical user interface*" (see Fig. 1 and related text, e.g. Col. 5:24-30.)

"*generating an export file in a format compatible with a system monitor, the export file comprising the modifiable severity and the modifiable second location*" (see

Figs. 2 and 7-8 and related text, e.g. Col. 11:62-65, Col. 12:33-38 (*modifiable second location*), and Col. 14:7-11 (*modifiable severity*).)

"*executing the system monitor on a computer to monitor the modifiable second location for one of the notification messages and to generate an alert that specifies the modifiable severity that corresponds to the notification message that is found in the modifiable second location*" (see Figs. 15-18 and related text, illustrating how the system is able to receive and process a message to determine a key, use that key to access a file relevant to that message and determine a message action, which action includes checking system files (*modifiable second location*) for the presence of the alert condition specified by the message, and subsequently alerting the user according to the modifiable parameters (*modifiable severity*) of that message action.)

Pickett et al. ('147) describe a communication process that receives messages from the entity being monitored (see Col. 5:15-18), and which analyzes those messages and processes them (see Figs. 4 and 5 and related text, e.g. Col. 7:33-45, describing messages stored in a memory buffer (*data file*)). However, Pickett et al. ('147) do not explicitly disclose that messages are extracted from the source file and stored in the data file, processing of the data file to remove duplicate messages, or that the notification message, modifiable severity, and modifiable second location are displayed simultaneously in the graphical user interface.

Mueller ('544) discloses a method and system for displaying error messages, comprising:

"*displaying in the graphical user interface simultaneously with the notification message, a modifiable severity and a modifiable second location corresponding to the notification message whereby the modifiable second location indicates a log file location where the notification messages are stored when generated by the computer application*" (see Figs. 2-3 and related text, e.g. Col. 3:25-30, Col. 3:49-51, and Col. 7:26-28. These teachings illustrate that a message is displayed in a graphical user interface, whose contents are modifiable, simultaneously with the file that the message is derived from (*modifiable second location [that] indicates a log file location where the notification messages are stored when generated by the computer application*), and optionally (and simultaneously) with a severity code that accompanies the message.)

Mueller ('544) states that "error data may be transmitted ... as message data when the system supports program to program messages", such as those described in the system of Pickett et al. ('147), "but it may also be communicated in file form." (See Col. 2:31-35) However, Mueller ('544) also does not explicitly disclose extraction of the message from the source file, or processing of the data file to remove duplicate messages.

Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) disclose a method for error identification in a program interface, comprising:

"*extracting the notification message from the source file*" (see Fig. 5-6 and related text, e.g. Col. 8:49-57, and Col. 9:17-23. These teachings describe a header file (*source file being stored in a first location*) which is parsed for error messages; the error

messages are extracted from the header file and placed in an error header file (*a modifiable second location*).)

Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) state that the names and locations of the header file (*source file of a computer application to be monitored*) and the error header file (*modifiable second location*) are contained in a database file (see Col. 8:18-25); it is well known in the art that the contents of database files are modifiable by a user. A user might modify the error header file, for example, to store generated errors in a different location to compare errors generated during different executions of the test program described by Smith, Jr. et al. (see Fig. 5 and related text, e.g. Col. 13:56-57, and Col. 14:19-20.). Further, the contents of this error header file could be transmitted in file form for presentation to the user through the graphical user interface disclosed by Mueller ('544), an interface that could be used to display the messages, modifiable severities, and modifiable file locations disclosed by Pickett et al. ('147). In receiving message contents from this header file, according to the system of Pickett et al. ('147), the message contents would be first stored in a memory buffer (*data file*) for later processing. However, Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) also do not disclose the processing of the data file to remove duplicate messages.

Greenfeld ('928) describes an apparatus for analyzing source code, in which he states that "In analyzing a source file, the analysis subsystem must first remove from the database any information extracted previously from this source file (*removing duplicate notification messages from the data file*) ... This prior removal is necessary for the reliability of the data in the database" (see Col. 7, l. 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the claimed invention was made by applicant to have modified the system of Pickett et al. ('147) with the teachings set forth by Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) to create a system capable of scanning files of computer applications, extracting messages from those applications and placing them in a data file, displaying information from the data file to the user regarding those messages, and generating export files usable to monitor the applications. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of invention by applicant to further modify the method of Pickett et al. ('147), modified by the teachings of Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510), further introducing the step of removing duplicate information from the data file using the teachings and motivation set forth in Greenfeld ('928). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make these modifications to enhance the system of Pickett et al. ('147) with the newer capabilities taught by Mueller ('544), Smith, Jr. et al. ('510), and Greenfeld ('928), thus providing a more robust system with greater functionality and ease of use.

11. Claims 8-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett et al. (5,062,147) in view of Mueller (6,115,544) and in view of Smith, Jr. et al. (5,761,510), and further in view of Warman et al. (5,657,221).

Referring to claims 8-9 and 13-14, the rejection of the appropriate base claim is incorporated. The combination of the system of Pickett et al. ('147) with the teachings of Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510) shows a system wherein the user modifies colors (*modifiable severity*) associated with messages (*notification messages*), and

wherein a message action file is generated for the system monitor (*format compatible with a system monitor*), as described above in the rejection of base claim 1. Additionally, Mueller describes the use of severity codes, displayable as letters or as numbers (see Col. 13-14: Error Information Record). However, none of the references explicitly disclose the step of translating the severities from numerical to textual form, or from textual to numerical form.

In an analogous art, Warman et al. ('221) describe a method of representing non-computer devices using a graphical representation on a computer display. The reference describes user manipulation of the graphically represented controls of the non-computer devices, such that the value represented by a control and displayed to the user may be transformed, including "converting a numerical value to a textual value" (see Figs. 4 and 9a and related text, e.g. Col. 4, l. 6-9, and Col. 16, l. 40-43). The reference teaches converting a numerical value to a textual value as an example, and therefore implies that a conversion from a textual value to a numerical value is also possible for a given control object. It is inherent that the conversion of the represented data from one form to another would be done to display the converted value to the user as appropriate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the claimed invention was made by applicant to modify the method of Pickett et al. ('147), modified by the teachings of Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510), to include the data manipulation step described in Warman et al. ('221) to change the severity codes from numerical to textual or textual to numerical for display purposes. It would

also have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to carry this modification through such that the message action file of Pickett et al. ('147) would reflect the converted severity values for desired use or display of the contents of the output file. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the method of Pickett et al. ('147), modified by the teachings of Mueller ('544) and Smith, Jr. et al. ('510), using the teachings of Warman et al. ('221) to display further contextual information to the user about the severity of the message received, that being numerical or textual values in addition to color information, which values could be translated from one form to the other.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicants are invited to review all cited references, as each reference contains teachings that show the state of this art.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew A. Dickeson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7219. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAD

WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER